

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for allegedly failing to show reference number 780 in Figure 10 as described in Paragraph 0092, line 17 of the specification. Applicant amends the description of Figure 10 (Paragraph [0092]) so as to correct the reference numbers. Accordingly, the objections to the drawings should be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The office action alleges that Applicant fails to teach "a plurality of control sections" in the disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees. "A plurality of control sections" is taught in the disclosure. More particularly, the "control sections" in the claims correspond to the "dummy load circuits" in the embodiments (not "control section 18"). The "circuits" in the claims do not correspond to the "dummy load circuits" in the embodiments.

In the detailed description of the invention, paragraph [0059], "dummy load circuits 31a to 31c for *controlling* the dummy load" are disclosed. In addition, in

paragraph [0060] it is disclosed that "in the dummy load circuit, an electric resistor and a condenser are connected in series". Thus it can be appreciated that the claimed "control sections" correspond to the disclosed and described "dummy load circuits".

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, Applicant amends Claim 1 to incorporate the features of claim 3 and part of the features of claim 7. With respect to amended claim 1, the claimed mechanical switches are different from the detecting switch 15 of Yoshimura. The mechanical switches of the present invention switch the electric connection condition between the control section and the liquid drop ejecting heads. In contrast, the detecting switch 15 of Yoshimura only detects the specification of an ink. In addition, Yoshimura does not disclose that a plurality of control sections are provided with plural liquid drop ejecting heads having different specifications. In particular, Yoshimura does not disclose that each head unit has control sections.

Claim 3 is canceled, as the features thereof are incorporated into claim 1.

Applicant amends Claim 7 based on paragraphs [0017], [0085], and [0086]. With respect to amended claim 7, Yoshimura does not disclose a plurality of control sections

provided with plural liquid drop ejecting heads having different specifications. In particular, Yoshimura does not disclose that each head unit has control sections.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

With regard to claim 9, Yoshimura does not disclose "selecting a liquid drop ejecting head which should be driven among plural liquid drop ejecting heads having different specifications from each other". The liquid drop ejecting heads of the present invention are different from each other (paragraph [0051], Lines 1-3). On the other hand, Yoshimura does not teach having a plurality of liquid drop ejecting heads having different specifications, but only applies a preferable voltage to each of the ink jet heads having the same specifications. Therefore, Yoshimura does not teach selecting a liquid ejecting head.

Applicant amends Claim 10. According to amended claim 10, since the control section (the dummy load circuit) is disposed in the head unit, it is possible to stably eject the liquid drop by only replacing the liquid drop ejecting head (Paragraph [0017] and [0086]). On the other had, Yoshimura does not teach a control section disposed in a head unit having a liquid drop ejecting head.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504) in view of Masunaga (JP H05-177833). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504) in view of Fuji et al. (US 5,975,668). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504) in view of Park (US 6,059,392). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above. Further, Yoshimura fails to teach a moving structure. Park teaches a sub-carriage that moves a printer head so as to adjust a gap between the printer head and a printer medium. However, the printer head of Park moves only to adjust the gap and has no necessity to synchronize the liquid drop ejecting heads practically. Furthermore, Yoshimura and Park do not teach a plurality of liquid drop ejecting heads having different specifications. Therefore, Yoshimura and Park do not teach an ejection driving control section which controls an ejection driving operation in either one of the liquid drop ejecting heads so as to synchronize the moving structure.

Claims 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504) in view of Shimoda (US 6,563,527). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 9 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura, et al. (JP H10-258504) in view of Yi et al. (US 6,428,151). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 depends from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 17 depends from claim 9 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2005

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/jmz]